

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Williams et al.

Serial No.: 09/590,646

Filed: June 8, 2000

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

For: REINFORCED, SELF-ALIGNING CONDUCTIVE STRUCTURES FOR SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE COMPONENTS AND METHODS FOR FABRICATING SAME

MAY 11, 2009

Confirmation No.: 1022

Examiner: J. Mitchell

Group Art Unit: 2813

Attorney Docket No.: 2269-4210US
(1999-0173.00/US)

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop ISSUE FEE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is filed in response to the Office Action mailed March 21, 2008, and sets forth Applicants' comments, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e), on the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowable Subject Matter accompanying the Office Action.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates:

[T]he prior art does not disclose or make obvious either the male or female member comprising at least an unconsolidated conductive material.

It is respectfully noted that the stated reasons for allowance are not applicable to all of the claims, as several claims lack the requirement of a male or female member that comprises an unconsolidated conductive material.

As for the claims to which the stated reasons for allowance apply, it should be noted that the stated reasons merely comprise a summary, which is not limiting. The scope of each claim should be based on its actual language and equivalents thereto, and not on a paraphrase or summary of the claim language.

The independent claims as allowed recite features in addition to, and in different language than, those described in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite elements in addition to those of the independent claims, which are also not reflected in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Such additional elements, in combination with those of the independent claims from which each claim depends, provide additional reasons for patentability. Accordingly, the scope of the claims must be determined from the literal language of each as a whole, as well as all equivalents thereof.

Therefore, to the extent that the Examiner's reasons for allowance as stated are not relevant to, or wholly encompassing of, a particular claim, independent or dependent, Applicants assume that (pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e)) the Examiner has determined that the record of the prosecution as a whole of the application makes clear the reasons for allowing those claims.

Further, it appears, pursuant to M.P.E.P. 1302.14, that the Examiner's Statements of Allowable Subject Matter are not intended to encompass all of the reasons for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Brick G. Power
Registration No. 38,581
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT, PC
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: May 11, 2009
BGP/ps:ec
Document in ProLaw